UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,688	10/541,688 04/18/2006 Chiyota Ogata		121036-0081	4029
35684 BUTZEL LON	7590 03/13/200 G	EXAMINER		
350 SOUTH M	AIN STREET	THOMAS, JAISON P		
SUITE 300 ANN ARBOR,	MI 48104	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1796	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/13/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent@butzel.com burns@butzel.com ball@butzel.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/541,688	OGATA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	Jaison P. Thomas	1796	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>2/13/2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLIC	ATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLC	WANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
		20 () (4)	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7 and 9-17</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>I-r and 3-17</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Mark Kopec/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1796	
	-		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons stated in the previous Office Action. Applicant's contends that the presence of embodiment including silica in the Shingo reference would not lead one skill in the art to exclude the use of silica as a filler or teach that the compositions of Shingo could be used as a seal molding material. Applicant cites nd cites the use of the "consists of" transitional phrase in Claim 1 limiting the types of filler used. Applicant further contends that the claim language of Claim 1 does not contain any "intended use" limitations. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that the "consists of" transitional phrase used in limiting the filler to carbon black would only exclude fillers which are required by the prior art, but would not exclude fillers which are optional components. As noted the Final Rejection, Shingo clearly teaches an example embodiment which only contains carbon black as a filler. Thus, the use of silica in Shingo is one option, however, it is not required in the Shingo composition. Thus the Examiner believes that prior art example still teaches a composition which is identical to the one claimed. With respect to the intended use limitations, the Examiner construes the claim as being drawn to a composition first and foremost. The fact that the composition can be used in a device (i.e. nickel hydrogen cell) does not alter the interpretation of the claim as being drawn to a composition containing EPDM, carbon black filler and organic peroxide. As such, the Examiner believes that due to identical composition being disclosed in the prior art when compared to the composition claimed, the prior art composition would be capable of being used in a seal molding application and that it would also inherently possess the "energized immersion durability" as required by Claim 1.